

REMARKS

Claims 18 to 36 are now pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of this response.

35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claim 31 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for enablement matters. The specification has been amended to include the text concerning the loudspeaker providing announcements from the original claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Specification as amended is allowable, and request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, of claim 31 be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 25 and 27 to 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,046,783 to Bosik et al. (“Bosik reference”). The Bosik reference refers to providing wired line telephone and mobile telephone cross-usage comprising the steps of deactivating call forwarding of incoming mobile telephone calls to a subscriber's home wired line telephone and for activating call forwarding of incoming wired line telephone calls to the subscriber's mobile telephone upon removal of the mobile telephone from a customer premises equipment (CPE) cradle. A customer premises equipment (CPE) cradle for providing home wired line and mobile telephone cross-usage has a conventional wired line telephone jack, an AC in plug/port, at least one connector pin, at least one charging pin, a detection switch, a support for the mobile telephone, a display and buttons unit, a charging mechanism, a detection switch and a programmable module.

Claim 25 of the present invention requires at least a device for cost-effective redirection of calls in which a cradle for a mobile radio communications network terminal is used which has integrated switchover function, which is located at the location of the home and/or the partner number, and the cradle has in its storage depression a first switch element, which is activated both by setting down and by removing the mobile radio communications network terminal, assigned to the cradle, of second subscriber, and a previously stored service telephone number is activated and triggered when the mobile radio communications network terminal is hung up, which in turn activates a service that redirects all calls destined for the mobile radio communications network terminal to the fixed network terminal that is registered as home or partner number and to which the cradle is assigned; and, *after removal of the mobile radio communications network terminal from the storage device and the attendant renewed actuation of the switch element, the switchover function is canceled again*

via the service telephone number triggered thereby. In contrast, the Bosik reference does not identically describe activation of a service that redirects all calls destined for the mobile radio communications network terminal to the fixed network terminal that is registered as home or partner number and to which the cradle is assigned, nor the switchover function being canceled upon the recited steps (as claimed) occurring. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 25 and 27 to 30 (which depend from claim 25) are allowable and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 26, 32, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the Bosik reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,950,674 to Jarrett et al. (“Jarrett reference”).

Claims 26, 32, and 33 depend from claim 25 which is believed allowable over the Bosik reference as described above. The Jarrett reference refers to a cordless mobile phone system being able to communicate signals 3 via antenna 2 and 3 with transponder unit 5, in which the system communicates via PSTN interface 9 and cable 10 connected to local-loop socket 11 within a fixed telephone network.

The Jarrett reference does not cure the deficiencies of the Bosik reference, in that the Jarrett reference focuses on the mechanical requirements of a cordless mobile phone system and does not describe activation of a service that redirects all calls destined for the mobile radio communications network terminal to the fixed network terminal that is registered as home or partner number and to which the cradle is assigned, nor the switchover function being canceled upon the recited steps (as claimed) occurring, as in claim 25 (from which claims 26, 32, and 33 depend). Further, claim 26, for example, focuses on the first switch element being a mechanically actuated time switch contact which triggers the switchover function with a time delay following actuation. Neither the Bosik or Jarrett reference teach or describe this feature. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 26, 32, and 33, (which depend from claim 25) are allowable over the Bosik and Jarrett references and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 31 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the Bosik reference in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0026317 to Labrique et al. (“Labrique reference”). Claim 31 depends from claim 25 which is believed allowable over the Bosik reference as described above. The Labrique reference refers to a process for outputting a spoken announcement, the content of which is a function of the data content of at least one data record, wherein an announcement type is selected by means of a first program segment on the basis of the data content, a second program segment for the program-controlled output

is made available, which second program segment is suitable for the selected announcement type, the parameters required for the second program segment which has been made available are determined, and the spoken announcement corresponding to the selected announcement type taking into account the determined parameters is output. The Labrique reference does not cure the deficiencies of the Bosik reference, in that the Labrique reference focuses on the use of a loudspeaker – which respectfully is believed to be different from that described in claim 31 -- of a cordless mobile phone system and does not describe activation of a service that redirects all calls destined for the mobile radio communications network terminal to the fixed network terminal that is registered as home or partner number and to which the cradle is assigned, nor the switchover function being canceled upon the recited steps (as claimed) occurring, as in claim 25 (from which claim 31 depends). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 31 (which depends from claim 25) is allowable over the Bosik and Labrique references and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 36 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the Bosik reference in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0043570 to Gossman et al. (“Gossman reference”). Claim 36 depends from claim 25 which is believed allowable over the Bosik reference as described above. The Gossman reference refers a telecommunication system in which to ensure a reliable activation and deactivation of a call diversion for subscribers who desire a call diversion in time periods ending at variable instants, there is proposed for the first subscriber station to comprise a signaling device for signaling an activated call diversion to the second subscriber station and a manually operable call diversion deactivator. The Gossman reference does not cure the deficiencies of the Bosik reference, in that the Gossman reference focuses on the use of call diversion in time periods ending at variable instants – which respectfully is believed to be different from that described in claim 36 -- of a cordless mobile phone system and does not describe activation of a service that redirects all calls destined for the mobile radio communications network terminal to the fixed network terminal that is registered as home or partner number and to which the cradle is assigned, nor the switchover function being canceled upon the recited steps (as claimed) occurring, as in claim 25 (from which claim 36 depends). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 36 (which depends from claim 25) is allowable over the Bosik and Gossman references and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 18 to 20, and 35, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0022660 to Payne et al. (“Payne reference”), in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0247107 to Chen et al. (“Chen reference”), and U.S. Patent

No. 6,615,034 to Alloune et al (“Alloune reference”). Claims 19, 20, and 35 depend from claim 18. Claim 18 is believed allowable over the Payne, Chen and Alloune references for at least the below-stated reasons. The Payne reference refers to a method for redirecting calls placed to a mobile phone having a redirect functionality and a second phone via a redirect service, which includes the steps of sending a redirect service request using the redirect button on the mobile phone to the second phone, activating the redirect service by the second phone responsive to the redirect service request, and redirecting incoming calls to the mobile phone to the second phone. The Chen reference refers to a call forwarding by establishing a generalized procedure for call delivery and call forwarding, in which an "integrated location management" component realizes the generalized procedure. The integrated location management component is a device capable of holding location information for diverse cellular networks, including Internet telephony systems. The Alloune reference refers to a communication billing system including processing a plurality of wireless service events from a wireless system together at the event level with a plurality of wireline service events from a wireline system to generate total charge records for a plurality of wireless services and a plurality of wireline services. Claim 18 requires a method for cost-effective redirecting of calls in which following activation of a corresponding call redirection function via a service telephone number, redirecting a call that originates from a terminal of a first subscriber and is destined for a first terminal of a second subscriber, to a second, alternative terminal of the subscriber whenever it is detected that a network-crossing connection setup between the terminal of the first subscriber and the first terminal of the second subscriber is required to establish the desired connection of the first subscriber, the call redirection function allowing a call redirection only to a second terminal of the second subscriber that can be assigned to the same communications network as the terminal of the first subscriber from which the call originates, so that, in a successful setup of the connection, the communication between the first subscriber and the second subscriber is conducted exclusively via one communications network, and, *in every successful setup of a call, the communication data records generated in connection with the call are recorded and analyzed in the processing system of the billing services to determine the saved network interworking costs, the second subscriber being allocated a freely specifiable portion of the saved network interworking costs once the saved network interworking costs have been determined.* The Payne, Chen, and Alloune references do not when taken together show all of the features of claim 18, including, for example, in every successful setup of a call, the communication data records generated in connection with the call are recorded and analyzed in the processing system of the billing services to

determine the saved network interworking costs, the second subscriber being allocated a freely specifiable portion of the saved network interworking costs once the saved network interworking costs have been determined. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 18 to 20 and 35 are allowable over the Payne, Chen, and Alloune, references and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the Payne reference, the Chen reference, the Alloune reference, and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2010/0240343 to Russell (“Russell reference”). Claims 21 and 22 depend from claim 18 and are believed allowable over the combination of Payne, Chen, and Alloune. The Russell reference is not a proper prior art reference in that it was filed after the present application was filed. The Payne, Chen, and Alloune, references do not when taken together show all of the features of claim 18 (from which claims 21 and 22 depend), including, for example, in every successful setup of a call, the communication data records generated in connection with the call are recorded and analyzed in the processing system of the billing services to determine the saved network interworking costs, the second subscriber being allocated a freely specifiable portion of the saved network interworking costs once the saved network interworking costs have been determined. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 21 and 22 are allowable over the Payne, Chen, and Alloune references and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the Payne reference, the Chen reference, the Alloune reference, and the Bosik reference. Claims 23 and 24 depend from claim 18 and are believed allowable over the combination of Payne, Chen, and Alloune. The Bosik reference does not cure their deficiencies. The Bosik, Payne, Chen, and Alloune, references do not when taken together show all of the features of claim 18 (from which claims 23 and 24 depend), including, for example, in every successful setup of a call, the communication data records generated in connection with the call are recorded and analyzed in the processing system of the billing services to determine the saved network interworking costs, the second subscriber being allocated a freely specifiable portion of the saved network interworking costs once the saved network interworking costs have been determined. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 23 and 24 are allowable over the Payne, Chen, Alloune, and Bosik references and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 34 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0181202 to Link II (“Link II reference”). The Link II reference refers

to in part an automatic telephone service forwarding device to forward the telephone service by causing the wireless telephone to transmit a forwarding message to a telephone redirection device on an overhead data channel associated with a wireless communications network or, the automatic telephone service forwarding device may forward the telephone service by placing a telephone call to the call redirection device. Claim 34 requires a device for cost-effective redirecting of calls, including a detector having a switch function assigned to a designated fixed network terminal of a second subscriber and able to detect a mobile radio communications network terminal, adapted thereto, the switch function linked to the detector is triggered automatically, the switch function accordingly activating a previously stored service telephone number, which triggers the redirecting of a call that is destined for the mobile radio communications network terminal and originates from a fixed network terminal of the first subscriber, and the removal of the mobile radio communications network terminal of the second subscriber from the action range of the detector triggers renewed activation of the service telephone number, which revokes the redirection again, so that all calls destined for the mobile radio communications network terminal of the second subscriber are once again forwarded to the designated mobile radio communications network terminal. The Link II reference does not appear to teach or suggest each of the above features, including the detector having a switch function and the revoking of the redirection again of claim 34.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references, taken alone or in combination (even though it is believed that they are not all properly combinable together), do not render obvious all of the features of claims 18 to 36. Applicants respectfully believe that claims 18 to 36, as amended above, should be allowed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, it is believed that rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 102(e), 103(a) have been obviated, and that all pending claims 18 to 36 are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn, and that the present application issue as early as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 9, 2011

By: /Linda Lecomte/
Linda Lecomte (Reg. No. 47,084)
KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646